



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/086,746	02/28/2002	Travis J. Parry	10012900-1	8769
7590 04/25/2008 HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY Intellectual Property Administration P.O. Box 272400 Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400			EXAMINER	
			LASHLEY, LAUREL, L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2132	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/25/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No. 10/086,746 Examiner LAUREL LASHLEY	Applicant(s) PARRY, TRAVIS J. Art Unit 2132
-----------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —

THE REPLY FILED 08 April 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on 08 April 2008. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because

(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);

(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Claim 24: 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____
Claim(s) objected to: _____
Claim(s) rejected: 1,5,8-12,15-17,20,21 and 24-34.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fail to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.

12. Note the attached *Information Disclosure Statement(s)*. (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____

13. Other: _____.

/Gilberto Barron Jr/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2132

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant's arguments have been considered but are not persuasive for the following reasons:

Applicant argues:

It is Applicant's assertion that Rourke, Docter, and Kawamura patents, individually or in combination, do not disclose a printer as claimed in independent claim 1, do not disclose a method as claimed in independent claim 11, and do not disclose a system as claimed in independent claim 20. Specifically, Applicant asserts that Docter does not disclose evaluating a file at a printer and controlling printing of the file by the printer based on a prespecified characteristic from a packet including the file, wherein processing of the file by the printer is terminated and/or printing of the file by the printer is prevented if the prespecified characteristic is an undesirable characteristic, and wherein processing of the file by the printer proceeds and/or printing of the file by the printer is conducted if the prespecified characteristic is a desirable characteristic, as claimed in independent claim 1,11 and 20.

Examiner responds:

The combined disclosure of Rourke and Docter meets Applicant's claim limitations. Rourke teaches a printing system (see Figure 1) which has been modified to include the filtering system of Docter (see Figure: 1: filtering system). Docter's filtering system, by virtue of a filtering system's functionality evaluates/analyzes files or documents based on specified characteristics, parameters, or criteria to determine (see column 3, lines 34-36), in view of Rourke, which files or documents are to actually be printed. It is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that a filtering system either enables or disables functionality from occurring. In this instance, the enabled or prohibited functionality is to process or terminate printing respectively. As such the Examiner believes the combination of Rourke and Docter meets Applicant's claim limitations.

The rejection of claims 1, 5, 8- 12, 15- 17, 20- 21, and 24-34 is maintained as in the FINAL Office Action mailed 01/08/2008.